

06-28-00

17

Practitioner's Docket No. 65545-0074

PATENT

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Box Patent Application  
Assistant Commissioner for Patents  
Washington, D.C. 20231

NEW APPLICATION TRANSMITTAL

Transmitted herewith for filing is the patent application of

Inventor(s): William R. Van Etten and Corey Prator

For (title): INFORMATION TRANSLATION COMMUNICATION PROTOCOL

1. Type of Application

This transmittal is for a continuation-in-part (C-I-P) application.

2. Benefit of Prior U.S. Application (35 U.S.C. 119(e), 120, or 121)

The new application being transmitted claims the benefit of prior U.S. application. Enclosed are  
ADDED PAGES FOR NEW APPLICATION TRANSMITTAL WHERE BENEFIT OF PRIOR U.S.  
APPLICATION CLAIMED.

CERTIFICATION UNDER 37 C.F.R. 1.10\*

(Express Mail label number is **mandatory**.)

(Express Mail certification is optional.)

I hereby certify that this correspondence and the documents referred to as attached therein are being deposited with the United States Postal Service on this date June 27, 2000, in an envelope as "Express Mail Post Office to Addressee," mailing Label Number EL 429 912 177 US, addressed to the: Assistant Commissioner for Patents, Washington, D.C. 20231.

Jennifer S. Greer

(type or print name of person mailing paper)

*Jennifer S. Greer*  
Signature of person mailing paper

**WARNING:** Certificate of mailing (first class) or facsimile transmission procedures of 37 C.F.R. 1.8 cannot be used to obtain a date of mailing or transmission for this correspondence.

**\*WARNING:** Each paper or fee filed by "Express Mail" **must** have the number of the "Express Mail" mailing label placed thereon prior to mailing 37 C.F.R. 1.10(b)  
"Since the filing of correspondence under § 1.10 without the Express Mail mailing label thereon is an oversight that can be avoided by the exercise of reasonable care, requests for waiver of this requirement will **not** be granted on petition " Notice of Oct. 24, 1996, 60 Fed. Reg. 56,439, at 56,442.

06/27/00  
jc662 U.S. PTO

jc498 U.S. PTO  
09/604472  
06/27/00

09604472 062700

3. Papers Enclosed  
A. Required for filing date under 37 C.F.R. 1.53(b) (Regular) or 37 C.F.R. 1.153 (Design) Application

26 Page(s) of Specification  
5 Page(s) of Claims  
9 Sheet(s) of Drawing(s)-Formal

- B. Other Papers Enclosed

1 Page(s) of abstract

4. Declaration or Oath

Will be filed at a later date.

5. Fee Calculation (37 C.F.R. 1.16)

Regular Application

CLAIMS AS FILED					
Claims	Number Filed	Basic Fee Allowance	Number Extra	Rate	Basic Fee 37 CFR 1.16(a) \$690.00
Total Claims (37 CFR 1.16(c))	20	- 20 =	0 x	\$18.00	\$0.00
Independent Claims (37 CFR 1.16(b))	3	- 3 =	0 x	\$78.00	\$0.00
Multiple Dependent Claim(s), if any (37 CFR 1.16(d))			+	\$260.00	\$0.00

Filing Fee Calculation

\$690.00

**6. Fee Payment Being Made at This Time**

Enclosed

Filing Fee	\$690.00
------------	----------

<b>Total Fees Enclosed</b>	<b>\$690.00</b>
----------------------------	-----------------

**7. Method of Payment of Fees**

Charge Account No. 18-0013 in the amount of \$690.00. A duplicate of this transmittal is attached.

**8. Authorization to Charge Additional Fees**

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge the following additional fees by this paper and during the entire pendency of this application to Account No. 18-0013.

37 C.F.R. 1.16(a), (f) or (g) (filing fees)

37 C.F.R. 1.16(b), (c) or (d) (presentation of extra claims)

37 C.F.R. 1.16(e) (surcharge for filing the basic filing fee and/or declaration on a date later than the filing date of the application)

37 C.F.R. 1.17(a)(1)-(5) (extension fees pursuant to § 1.136(a))

37 C.F.R. 1.17 (application processing fees)

**9. Instructions as to Overpayment**

Credit Account No. 18-0013.

**ADDED PAGES FOR NEW APPLICATION TRANSMITTAL WHERE BENEFIT OF  
PRIOR U.S. APPLICATION CLAIMED**

**10. Relate Back**

This application claims the benefit of U.S. Patent Application No. 09/348,693 filed on July 7, 1999.

**11. NOTIFICATION IN PARENT APPLICATION OF THIS FILING**

A notification of the filing of this continuation-in-part is being filed in the parent application, from which this application claims priority under 35 U.S.C. § 120.



SIGNATURE OF PRACTITIONER

Reg. No. 36018  
Tel. No.: (248) 594-0600

Customer No.: 010291

Michael B. Stewart  
Rader Fishman & Grauer PLLC  
39533 Woodward Avenue, Suite 140  
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48304

R0086627

## **INFORMATION TRANSLATION COMMUNICATION PROTOCOL**

### **FIELD OF THE INVENTION**

5           This application is a continuation in part of US application serial no. 09/348,693, filed on July 7, 1999, the contents of which are incorporated in their entirety. The present invention relates in general to a procurement system. More specifically, the invention relates to a procurement system where a user completes a structured requisition form based predominantly on pre-existing normalized  
10 relationships to order an item not available in a catalog database. The form is used to specify the desired item and to selectively create updated normalized relationships for use in identifying the new item so that it and similar items may be placed in the catalog database when free form data is examined using the normalized relationships.

### **BACKGROUND OF THE INVENTION**

15           Procurement systems are well known. A buyer searches a catalog or a catalog database, locates material of interest, and places an order. A supplier then fulfills the order. However, special orders greatly complicate and slow down the entire procurement process as well as greatly increasing procurement expense. In practice, a buyer who cannot find an item located in a catalog must fill out a special requisition,  
20 also known as a special order request. However, no order is even placed until a potential supplier and related cost and delivery information is provided to the buyer for consideration.

          The requisition is then sent to a procurement fulfillment organization. A fulfillment specialist reviews the special requisition and manually determines if there  
25 are any potential suppliers that can fulfill the special requisition. Potential suppliers are then contacted and they respond accordingly. Each of the suppliers has their own way of describing the items it carries. Thus, the fulfillment specialist must manually

review each supplier proposal and determine which ones appear to be most favorable to the buyer.

Next, the buyer must receive the best proposals from the fulfillment specialist, determine which one appears to be the most appropriate for that organization, and manually go through a special order process for the special requisition to actually be fulfilled by a supplier. Worse yet, when the special order is finally fulfilled, all of the special effort that went into manually reviewing the requisition, manually determining potential suppliers, manually locating the best suppliers, and then actually fulfilling the special order is lost. Thus, the entire process must be re-initiated if a different buyer wants the same or a similar special order in the future.

Thus, there is a strong need for a procurement system that takes into account special requisitions and resulting special orders, and uses the information related to such special orders so that the effort spent on fulfilling each order is not lost. In particular, it would be highly desirable to be able to receive a special requisition, and use a methodology to automatically select most likely suppliers without human intervention. If such an automatic selection process were available, then the special requisition could automatically be sent to each vendor for review and quoting. Moreover, it would be highly desirable to be able to receive the information from each supplier in a consistent format so that review of the received information could be automated as well according to pre-determined criteria to select the best supplier(s) for a possible special order. Additionally, it would be desirable to use the special expertise of both buyers and suppliers to create updated rules and item information associated with the special order. Therefore, future orders of the same item would not require the same special handling.

### SUMMARY OF THE INVENTION

An inventive procurement system according to the present invention takes advantage of the information transferred between a buyer, a procurement fulfillment organization, hereinafter called a back office, and a supplier to automate and continuously update a catalog database of items.

In practice, a buyer searches for an item in one or more catalog databases using a parametric or text search strategy. If the item is not found, the user then creates a special requisition that will uniquely identify the desired item. The requisition is transmitted to the back office, which then forwards it to potential suppliers. One or more of the suppliers review and revise the requisition and send it back to the back office. The back office uses predetermined criteria to select one or more of the suppliers and then provides the buyer with the supplier information. The buyer may place an order for the special item.

A key advantage of the present invention is that both the catalog database as well as the special requisition are normalized using predetermined rules related to class, attribute, and value relationships that are already known to the back office, and must be followed by the buyer to create the special requisition. Generally, these rules are stored in a knowledge base. When the back office receives free form item data, the free form data is processed through the knowledge base to create the normalized database that a user searches. The rules used to create the normalized database are made available to the buyer to locate a specific item.

Thus, when making a special requisition for an item not in the database, the buyer first identifies the item using all available class, attribute, and value relationships used to create the normalized database. The remaining class, attribute

and value relationship information required to uniquely identify the desired special item are then suggested by the buyer and forwarded to the back office.

The back office uses the pre-existing information identified by the buyer to pre-select potential suppliers that are already associated with the selected classes, attributes, and values and automatically forwards the special requisition to them. Thus, no human intervention is required.

One or more of the suppliers review and revise the special requisition using the same relationship approach as followed by the buyer and dictated by the pre-existing rules of the knowledge base and then returns it to the back office. Thus, at least two experts (i.e., the buyer and the supplier) have proposed a revised normalization relationship to uniquely identify a desired item in accordance with the pre-determined rules. The revised normalization relationship may be used to create a new rule for the knowledge base to process future items with no further human intervention.

Moreover, by having a normalized item selection process, the desired item and related items may be readily added to a catalog database for future selection by other buyers. Such an approach takes advantage of the expertise of the buyer and supplier in fulfilling a special requisition while eliminating the need to undertake the same process for other buyers. The catalog database is automatically updated as required over time, generating catalog database updating in a real time fashion.

Yet another advantage of having a normalized approach to the special requisition process is to permit easy item comparison by a buyer. When more than one potential supplier of a desired item is located, having the item information in a normalized fashion according to class, variable and value relationships provides easy comparison of the various items by the buyer. Thus, comparison-shopping is



expedited to the benefit of all parties since fewer returns are likely when the item criteria are clearly understood.

### **BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF THE DRAWINGS**

The features and inventive aspects of the present invention will become more apparent upon reading the following detailed description, claims, and drawings, of which the following is a brief description:

Figure 1 is a schematic overview of key elements of the present invention including a buyer, supplier, and a back office with both the supplier and the buyer communicating with the back office.

Figure 2 is a flow chart of a procurement system according to the present invention.

Figure 3 is an example of an advanced search screen discussed with respect to the present invention.

Figure 4 is an example of the hits located from undertaking an advanced search according to the present invention.

Figure 5 is an illustration of the class hierarchy of the normalized item data according to the present invention where if gases are selected, at least two sub-classes of gases are provided.

Figure 6 is an example of a parametric search screen provided after a leaf class has been selected.

Figure 7 is an illustration of a product comparison screen according to the present invention.

Figure 7A is an illustration of a graphical based product comparison screen comparing the values associated with two different attributes with data points representing different items having the plotted values for the indicated attributes.

Figure 8 is a flow chart illustrating a preferred embodiment of a structured requisition subsystem according to the present invention.

Figure 8A is an illustration of a structured product requisition form displayed on a computer screen.

5        Figure 9 is a flow chart illustrating a preferred embodiment of a catalog update subsystem according to the present invention.

Figure 10 is a representation of the relationships between the various elements of the present invention including the buyer, buyer interface application, back office (including catalog database, common language generator and knowledge base, and  
10    back office communications interface), and supplier/supplier interface application.

#### **DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF PREFERRED EMBODIMENTS**

A procurement system 20 is illustrated in Figure 1 that includes a buyer 22, a procurement fulfillment organization hereinafter referred to as back office 24, and suppliers 26. As shown by a communications link 28, buyer 22 communicates with  
15    back office 24 to search or select item information and to place an order. To facilitate the item order process, back office 24 has one or more catalog databases 32 that are normalized using a common language generator ("CLG") and corresponding CLG knowledge base 30, discussed in greater detail below. In turn office 24 communicates with suppliers 26 as shown by communications link 34 to get information not in its  
20    catalog databases 32 or to forward an order received from a buyer 22. Then the appropriate supplier 26 or its agent ships the requested item directly to buyer 22, fulfilling the order as shown by line 36.

Procurement system 20 is illustrated in greater detail in Figure 2. First, buyer 22 logs onto a buyer interface application 40, described in greater detail below with  
25    respect to Figure 10, at start point 42. Next, buyer 22 determines at decision point 44

if it will be selecting an item from a hot list. A hot list is typically a listing of items associated with a particular buyer 22 based on past purchase history or preferences. In some cases it may represent the purchase history or preferences of the buyer's organization. Unlike catalog databases 32, a hot list is typically stored within application 40 and periodically updated to take into account discontinued items and the like. Thus, a hot list is generally static. It may or may not include parametric information such as that discussed below. If it does not then a text search or browsing is required to find an item. If an item is selected from a hot list, it may include a dynamic link to a database 32 that the item originally came from, thus providing updated information such as pricing.

If the desired item is found in the hot list as shown at decision point 52, then the user is next asked if there are any additional items to be ordered at decision point 54. If yes, then the item selected is temporarily stored at point 56 and buyer 22 returns to start point 42 to select the next desired item. If no additional items are desired then an order is created at point 58. Even if an item comes from more than one source such as a hot list or one or more databases 32, point 56 represents a common holding point such as a shopping cart. The option to modify the item selection is permitted at decision point 60. If an item is to be modified, then buyer 22 is returned to start point 42. Otherwise, any additional information is entered as required at point 62 and the order is submitted at point 64. In many cases, specific approval is not required if the standard buyer catalog database 32 or a hot list 44 is used. In some cases, however, an approval process is required by the buyer's organization as shown at point 66. Once the order has been approved, it is then placed by the buyer's organization as shown at point 68. Back office 24 informs one or more suppliers 26 who fulfill the order as shown by item 36, and discussed with respect to Figure 1. The

items are shipped to the buyer 22 according to buyer purchasing preferences. Finally, the procurement process ends at termination point 69.

If an item is not found using the hot list at decision point 52, additional methods for locating a desired item are available. First, the user is returned to start

5 42. If the hot list option is not selected, then at decision point 70 buyer 22 is asked if she will be using a standard buyer catalog database 32. If yes, then the standard database 32 is selected at point 71. Typically, a buyer accesses a standard buyer catalog database 32 that has been put together by his organization for routine purchases and that represents the purchasing preferences of the organization. If not,  
10 then additional database catalog(s) may be used as shown at point 72. One possible database is a cumulative global database representing all items tracked by back office 24 for many suppliers and buyer organizations. Other databases 32 may include an intermediate catalog based on geography, subject matter or the like. For example, an organization may have a regional database 32 including items available in a specific  
15 geographic region that is searched before a master catalog acting as a cumulative global database 32 is searched. Different databases 32 may be available depending on the characteristics of the buyer 22 including company, geographic information, and even buyer classification within an organization.

Once the desired database 32 has been selected, buyer 22 may conduct an  
20 advanced text search for a desired item as shown at decision point 74 and illustrated in Figure 3. As shown in Figure 3, buyer 22 may refine the area of searching by selecting a category as shown at point 76, enter a search string as shown at point 78, select Boolean operators such as “OR” and “AND” as shown at point 80, and even select specific parameter fields to search as shown at point 82. Finally, the number of hits to  
25 display is selected at point 84. The user then reviews the search results at point 86. An

example output according to one such search result is illustrated in Figure 4. Then the system continues at decision point 52 as discussed above. However, if an item is not located and the user chooses to search a different set of catalog databases, then again selecting advanced text search at decision point 74 will pull up the most recent search.

5 Thus, all of the search information does not have to be re-added.

More typically, however, a buyer 22 takes advantage of the normalization features of system 20 by navigating the organizational hierarchy of items stored within one or more databases 32 and uniquely identified using a class/attribute/value relationship rather than conducting an advanced search. Thus, if a text search is not  
10 conducted as shown at decision point 74, buyer 22 then selects item classes as shown at point 90. Buyer 22 drills down through the various item classes that are presented in a hierarchical format. As shown in figure 5, for example, selecting a class "gases" will present the sub-class under it. Selection of the sub-class will present the sub-sub-class and so on. The process continues as shown by decision point 92 until a leaf  
15 class (the last class in a class hierarchy) is selected.

Once a leaf class is selected, a parametric search engine is presented as shown at point 94. The parametric search engine presents the attributes associated with a specific item leaf class and valid values associated with each attribute. The attributes can be presented in a variety of selection objects, such as drop-down boxes, list boxes,  
20 and sets of check boxes as shown in the example of Figure 6. The user selects the value and clicks an operator button. Within the Parametric Search, there is an undo button that removes the value in the search for items.

Typically there are three types of attributes: static, differentiating, and dynamic. A Stock Keeping Unit ("SKU") represents a specific item as defined by its  
25 differentiating attributes. For example, if an item is a shirt with differentiating

attributes color and size, then blue XL shirt is a SKU. Static attributes define an intrinsic property of a product and do not vary based on a SKU. A differentiating attribute is an attribute that defines the uniqueness of a SKU. A dynamic attribute is an attribute that is associated with a product dynamically at buy time.

5           Once buyer 22 has selected all available attribute values then the buyer must determine if additional specifying is required as shown at decision point 96. If no additional specifying is required then system 20 passes to decision point 98. At decision point 98 the use of the class/attribute/value approach permits a comparison of multiple items that meet the parametric search criteria and the selection of the item  
10       that meets the buyer's specific requirements as best illustrated in the example of Figure 7 and shown at point 100. When listing items for comparison, it is possible to have items matching the search criteria displayed using different rules associated with that database 32 such as a preferred vendor selected by the buyer 22. Each database 32 may have its own preferred rules for displaying information. When more than one  
15       database 32 is being searched, the rules may be combined or the rules of one database 32, e.g., the local catalog of the buyer 22, may take precedence over the rules of a second database 32, e.g. a master catalog being accessed by the buyer.

While not illustrated in the Figures, item comparison may also be implemented when doing an advanced text search. By using the class/attribute/value  
20       approach, a consistent and specific determination of item elements is accomplished. In practice such an approach reduces buyer confusion regarding item features and provides a listing of all values available with respect to a specific attribute of interest to a specific buyer.

As shown in Figure 7, additional item information may be reviewed by  
25       clicking on the hyperlink associated with the specific item. Moreover, information

about the merchant or supplier 26 may be determined by clicking on the hyperlink next to the item. Additional information such as item identification number, manufacturer, units of measure, and pricing is also illustrated.

It is also possible to compare items at point 100 using a graphical approach.

5 As shown in Figure 7A two attributes for notebook computer are being compared, namely processor speed versus price. Various models of notebook computers are plotted on the two dimensional graph. Moving a mouse over each data point reveals information concerning that item. For example, as shown in the Figure, the cursor is over the designation "Portege 7020CT", revealing a picture in the right hand portion  
10 of the screen of what the item looks like. While a two dimensional graph is shown, it is possible to compare more than two attributes at the same time. For example, a three-dimensional graph may allow a comparison of three attributes.

A preferred embodiment of the invention permits the use of a text search option even when undertaking a parametric search. For example, a user may desire to  
15 quickly find out if a database includes blue pencils. Therefore, once a class for pencils is selected, a text search may be desired to determine if there are any pencils with the color blue, thereby bypassing the rest of the class, attribute and value determinations.

To help a user determine the best balance between a parametric search and a  
20 text search, in a preferred embodiment of the invention additional information is provided as either a parametric search or a text search is undertaken. For a parametric search, under each class, the total number of children classes as well as the total number of items associated with the selected class is provided dynamically as part of an interactive feedback mechanism. As a user gets closer to a leaf class, the number of  
25 additional classes and the number of items associated with that class is reduced. For a

text search, feedback in terms of the number of items satisfying the search is provided interactively and dynamically as the buyer 22 types a search string at point 78 or enters various operators at point 80 or parameter fields at point 82. When a text search is undertaken as part of a parametric search, the number of items is based on the search parameters already satisfied with respect to the parametric search. Besides helping to further fine-tune a search strategy, a user is dynamically informed of problems including a mistyping or the use of unduly limiting Boolean operators.

While Figure 2 shows comparing items at item 98, in a preferred embodiment of the invention, it is possible to provide a comparison table or graph even before either a leaf class or parametric values are entered, particularly if there is a sufficiently small number of items at the indicated level of the parametric search. Therefore, in a more preferred embodiment of the invention, there is a comparison feature at each level of a parametric search. A table generated by system 20 preferably includes a listing of attributes and the values for each attribute for a located item, as shown in Figure 7. The attributes typically represent column headers, and may be moved around or deleted as desired by a user. Alternatively, a graph may be generated as shown above with respect to Figure 7A.

Then system 20 continues as discussed above at decision point 52 where the item may be selected for purchase by clicking the “Add” icon and the process continues as discussed above until the procurement process is complete. If an item is not located using the class/attribute/value relationship approach then the user is returned to start 42. As with the advance text search option, if the select class option is again selected the most recent leaf category will be provided to avoid the need to re-enter all of the search criteria.



As noted above, it is possible to select from a variety of catalog databases 32 at point 72. If an item is not located during an initial search of previously selected databases 32, requiring a return back to start point 42, system 20 may be designed to automatically add pre-determined additional databases. In the alternative, a buyer 22  
5 may choose which databases 32 to search. In either case, the addition of different databases 32 after an initial search of one or more databases 32 is an example of a cascading search.

To facilitate such a search, particularly when conducting a parametric search, in a preferred embodiment of the invention the various databases 32 include consistent  
10 classes, leaf classes, attributes, and values. Thus, information provided in an earlier search is passed to a later search, including the class node or path, attributes for the class, and the corresponding values for the attributes. For example, assume a user is looking for a blue pencil, but the usual database 32 does not include such a pencil. Moreover, assume that the first database searched includes an attribute called "Pencil  
15 Color", but lacks the value of blue. A different database 32 includes a pencil with all of the attributes and values located with respect to the first database 32, but includes the desired blue pencil. If that database is searched then the value "blue" will appear under the attribute called "Pencil Color" with the organization of the classes, attributes, and attribute values preferably the same. Thus, a user will only have to  
20 look under the appropriate attribute listing for "Pencil Color" since the search parameters will already be populated based on the earlier search.

To populate a pre-existing search it is generally preferable to send the search criteria between databases 32 as opposed to bringing an entire catalog itself down to the location of a buyer 22. The search criteria are either sent to one or more different  
25 servers or possibly to one or more additional databases 32 on the same server as that

of the database 32 originally searched. The population of the search criteria can be done in parallel simultaneously against multiple catalogs as represented by databases 32 to provide initial feedback to a user concerning the number of items that meet the search criteria for each of the available databases 32 as discussed above. When a  
5 buyer 22 selects particular catalogs or databases 32 to browse, that buyer is then typically presented with the parametric search screen for those products that match the search criteria found in those catalogs.

While the present invention recognizes that protocols such as Extensible Markup Language ("XML") may be used to populate a search criteria, when a typical  
10 Internet web browser such as Internet Explorer or Netscape Communicator are being used, the search criteria are included in a Uniform Resource Locator ("URL") query string.

A cascading search using a common hierarchy provides a number of advantages. For example, it makes it easier to copy search information when  
15 searching between databases 32 without requiring undue additional re-inputting from a buyer 22. Additionally, it permits synchronization between databases 32. It is easy to move items between databases 32 when they have a common hierarchical scheme. Moreover, a common interface may be provided to a user even when searching between different catalogs. For example, if search results are provided in a top frame  
20 of a web browser for a database 32, the same frame and output format may be used for a different database 32, where information about the second database may or may not be given. Thus, movement between databases 32 may be generally transparent to a buyer 22.

While it is desired to have a common hierarchy scheme between databases 32,  
25 system 20 recognizes that it may be desirable to have exception lists between two

different databases 32. For example, an exception list may be used to provide translations between different languages. Thus, a class, attribute or value in one language will be compared with a translation table to permit it to be matched with a corresponding class, attribute or value in a second language associated with a different database 32.

If a user desires additional specifying at decision point 96 of Figure 2, then structured requisition subsystem 102 is invoked as shown in Figure 8 to create a structured requisition. A key advantage of the invention is that buyer 22 has already reduced the scope of the item requisition through the familiar normalized selection process. Thus, in most cases item classes and sub-classes have likely been determined. In many cases, the classes have been determined all the way down to a leaf class. However, if the leaf class has not been selected as shown at decision point 104, then buyer 22 is provided with a revised selection screen from which she can select from available classes to further refine the item selection process as shown at point 106. Unlike in the regular procurement process, however, the classes are not limited to the specified catalog database 32. Instead all the classes from the master or global catalog database 32 are made available to the user to expedite the item location process. Additionally, attribute and even value information may be made available from the master or global catalog database 32.

If a leaf class has already been selected or once a leaf class is determined, then a modified parametric search screen with the most recently selected acceptable class is provided at point 108. It may also include the pre-selected attribute and even value information. Similarly, unlike the regular item selection process discussed above, the attributes and value selections are not restricted to the database 32 originally selected by the buyer 22. Instead, they include all possible attributes and values for a selected

leaf class in all catalog databases 32 available from back office 24. Thus, in many cases, a user will not have to manually enter any additional information into the modified parametric search screen. However, unlike the screen shown in Figure 6, as shown at point 110 buyer 22 has the ability to add new values for any selected attribute to better identify a desired item as shown at point 112. For example, if a faster CD ROM drive is required, buyer 22 can add the speed of the drive required as a new value. Moreover, if a required attribute, such as screen size, is missing, the buyer may be given permission to add the newly desired attribute along with a desired value. In some cases, a buyer 22 may even be able to propose a new class hierarchy. Under all circumstances a memo field is also provided for clarification of item requirements even if a buyer 22 is limited to only proposing new attribute values.

An example of a structured requisition form is illustrated in Figure 8A. As shown in Figure 8A, it is possible to select from a drop down menu of available choices or manually enter a value for a given attribute (called a feature in the Figure). There is also a memo field available for additional information not represented by the available attributes. In some cases it may be possible to include in the memo field the contents of a text search conducted before getting the structured requisition page or even other free text information. More typically, however, only pre-selected parametric information in the form of class, attribute and value information is passed to the structured requisition form as discussed above.

Once the structured requisition is completed at point 114, it is submitted to back office 24 by way of communications link 28. Communications link 28 was discussed with respect to Figure 1, above. At the same time, buyer 22 is returned back to the calling point of system 20 at point 116 so that additional items may be selected or a partial order completed.

Upon receipt of the structured requisition at point 118, back office 24 reviews the requisition to determine if it is correct as shown at decision point 120. If not, then buyer 22 is notified at point 122 by way of link 28 and the structured requisition subsystem 102 terminates at end point 124.

5 If the requisition is correct, then it is compared with all items in the master database 32 corresponding to the selected classes/attributes/values as shown at decision point 126. If one or more matches are found at decision point 126, communications link 28 provides the purchase information to buyer 22 for order submission at point 128. In a preferred embodiment, an electronic mail message is  
10 sent to buyer 22 with a hyperlink that will be recognized by a web browser such as Netscape® Navigator or Microsoft® Explorer. Buyer 22 clicks on the hyperlink and is routed to a screen very similar to the comparison screen of Figure 7, where the matches may be reviewed and the desired item selected. As discussed in greater detail below, buyer 22 preferably interacts with the buyer interface application 40 and back  
15 office 24, including databases 32 using a web browser. Upon selecting the desired item, buyer 22 is preferably immediately reinserted back into procurement system 20 as shown at point 130, returning to point 98, so that the purchase process may be completed.

A key advantage of the present invention occurs if the desired item is not in  
20 the master catalog database 32. At point 132 the structured requisition is automatically reviewed by back office 24 using the class/attribute/value information and normalized database information at its disposal. Based on the information provided by the buyer 22, automated systems of back office 24 route the structured requisition to potential suppliers as shown at point 134 using communications link 34.  
25 Communications link 34 was first discussed with respect to Figure 1. Back office 24

knows the suppliers associated with particular classes and sub-classes of goods and can often fine-tune a requisition submission to very specific suppliers based on attributes and values provided within the structured requisition.

In a preferred embodiment, an electronic mail message is sent to potential suppliers again using hyperlink and web browser technology, as discussed above. Preferably, as discussed further below with respect to Figure 10, supplier 26 interacts with a supplier interface application 135 using a web browser. As each supplier receives message at point 136, it clicks on the hyperlink and is brought to a screen where the structured requisition is provided within application 135. The supplier 26 may provide additional class/value/attribute information to better classify the item based on the specialized knowledge of the supplier and the items within its inventory. If the supplier has an item that it believes will meet the buyer's structured requisition criteria, it then submits a revised requisition as shown at point 138 that is then transmitted back to back office 24 by way of communications link 34 as shown at point 140. The revised requisition includes all of the item related information required by buyer 22 to make a purchasing decision. Under some circumstances portions of application 135 may even be part of back office 24, but the supplier 26 still requires some type of interface application such as a web browser.

Typically, all suppliers 26 receiving a structured requisition are given a predetermined amount of time to provide a revised requisition. When either the time for replying expires or all pre-selected suppliers provide a revised requisition, then at point 142 back office 24 compares the revised requisitions to determine the best supplier or suppliers for the specific buyer 22. Back office 24 uses a wide range of objective and subjective criteria to determine the best supplier(s) including geographic location, price, reputation, timeliness, and the like. Often, the criteria include those

predetermined by the buying organization based on its specific requirements or desires. As a result, the wishes of the buying organization are automatically considered to expedite the purchase process and reduce both cost and inconvenience.

Once one or more items are screened as best meeting the needs of buyer 22,  
5 they are then provided to the buyer as shown at point 128, and discussed above.

As shown in Figure 8, structured requisition subsystem actually forks at point 140. The first fork has been discussed above. However, the second fork, related to catalog update subsystem 150, is discussed in more detail in Figure 9.

The use of a normalized parametric search has been discussed above. Every  
10 item in a catalog database is normalized in terms of class hierarchy with a final leaf class being followed by a series of attributes and attribute values. As a result of the normalization process, item determination and searching is greatly enhanced. When undertaking a structured requisition, the same normalized data is used to the extent that it is available to buyer 22. A specialized supplier having expertise with respect to  
15 the class/attributes/values with which a requisitioned item is associated then further refines the structured requisition. Thus, both a knowledgeable buyer 22 and a knowledgeable supplier 26 are providing normalized relationships between an item and its defining characteristics. The relationships are used to provide selective rule updates to the common language generator knowledge base 30 and to an associated  
20 catalog database 32 using the predetermined rules of the knowledge base, as updated from time to time, to convert raw or free form data into the preferred normalized format. Thus, once a catalog database 32 is established, the catalog database is continuously fine-tuned by suppliers, buyers, and changing market conditions of which both are aware.

Items may be moved or copied between different databases 32 based on various business requirements such as purchase history as tracked by back office 24. The information is easily moved by using the common parametric hierarchy disclosed in the present invention.

5 While a separate knowledge base 30 is illustrated, it is possible to bypass the knowledge base 30 completely and update a database 32 directly, so long as the class/attribute/value relationships are maintained. An advantage of using a separate knowledge base 30, however, is where one or more new rules are specified that are later available to be able to normalize free form data.

10 As shown in Figure 9, when a revised requisition is received from a specific supplier, the revised requisition is reviewed at point 152. The class/attribute/value relationships are extracted from the revised requisition and audited by back office 24 at point 154. The information is audited at point 156 by comparing it to existing class/attribute/value relationships to determine if the common language generated  
15 knowledge base requires one or more new predetermined rules with a subsequent refreshing to the catalog database of the updated information available for the item. Preferably, the information of several revised requisitions corresponding to a single structured requisition is compared to determine normalized consistency among various suppliers. Once the audit is completed, a determination is made at decision  
20 point 158 as to whether updated classes/attributes/values are required for the requisitioned item. If not, then the revised requisition is refined using pre-existing class/attribute/value information as shown at point 160. Then at decision point 162 the determination is made as to whether the requisitioned item should be imported into the supplier database associated with the specific supplier 26. If yes, then the  
25 supplier catalog database 32 is updated at point 164 using the updated information



associated with the item and the sub-system then ends at termination point 166. If the supplier database 32 is not updated, then at decision point 168 the decision is made whether to import the requisitioned item into the master database(s) 32. If yes, then the master catalog database(s) are updated at point 170 using the updated information associated with the item. While not illustrated in the figure, the same approach may be used to update the standard buyer catalog database 32 instead of or in addition to the master database 32, if so desired. However, once the appropriate catalog database is updated, if any, sub-system 150 then ends at termination point 166.

Catalog database 32 has been designated fairly generically. The database 32 may be a separate database of items from a specific supplier. Alternatively it may be a composite database. When acting as a composite database, it may represent items from multiple suppliers that can be organized for and based on the buying habits of a single buying organization (e.g., the standard buyer catalog database discussed above) or upon the buying habits of a group of related buying organizations (e.g., as in hospitals and doctors' offices that are members of a group purchasing organization). Therefore, when a database 32 is updated, it may be any one or a combination of databases 32 depending on the desires of the supplier buyer 22 or her buying organization, suppliers 26, and back office 24.

At decision point 158 if the decision is made that the normalized information associated with the revised requisition is new, then the determination must be made whether to revise the common language generated knowledge base at decision point 172. If the decision is made not to update the knowledge base then sub-system ends at termination point 166. On the other hand, if the decision is made to update the knowledge base then it is updated with the new information at point 174. Then the decision must be made at point 176 whether to update existing catalog entries based

on the updated knowledge base. If yes, then the entries are updated at point 178 using the updated normalized information that can be associated with the raw or free form item data associated with each entry. If no, then the entries are not updated. Then subsystem moves on to decision point 162 as discussed above.

5           The system based interaction between buyer 22, back office 24, and supplier 26 is explained in greater detail in Figure 10. As shown in Figure 10, buyer 22 interacts with a buyer interface application 40. Preferably, the interface is web based, permitting a buyer 22 to interact with application 40 using a standard web browser such as Netscape® Navigator or Microsoft® Explorer. Buyer 22 logs on and off  
10 from the browser to application 40 as shown by line 200. In turn the log on information is authenticated with a back office communications interface 202 as shown by communications link 28. As illustrated, besides authentication information, order placement information, structured requisition information, the buyer's supplier selection criteria, supplier availability, buyer notification or order status and the like is  
15 also communicated by way of communication link 28 between application 40 and interface 202. Even catalog data base information stored based on pointers provided by direct buyer inquiry to a database 32 may be sent using communications link 28.

After buyer 22 logs on, item selection is accomplished using a hot list, advanced text searching, class/attribute/value selection, or a structured requisition  
20 request as discussed above. The item selection process requires that a catalog database 32 be queried for information directly by buyer 22 as shown by line 204. An order submission is made as shown by line 64 and discussed above, that is passed to application 40 from buyer 22. Any required approval process is shown by item 66 and an order placement made after any approvals is shown by item 68, both of which  
25 were discussed above. Once an order is placed, order status may be passed from

interface 202 to application 40 and then to buyer 22 as shown by line 206 until the order is fulfilled by a supplier 26.

If a structured requisition is required, the complete listing of available classes/attributes/values is retrieved from the master or global catalog database 32 as shown by line 208. The structured requisition is passed from buyer 22 to application 40 by line 210 where the structured requisition is submitted as shown at point 114, much as if it were an order. Alternatively, the information may be passed directly from buyer 22 to back office 24 by way of communications link 28. If one or more items are located using structured requisition subsystem 102, the information regarding item availability is typically passed from back office communications interface 202 to application 40. Next, the information is passed to buyer 22 in the form of an electronic message with a link pointing buyer 22 to a server with the desired item information. The hyperlinked information may be within back office 24 or transferred directly to application 40 as desired.

As shown in Figure 10, buyer 22 has direct access to one or more catalog databases 32 that are not stored within buyer interface application 40. However, as shown by communications link 28 and discussed above, appropriate authentication is required before a user can access the catalog databases 32, requiring the use of the communication link 28 between buyer 22, application 40 and back office 24 with database 32. Once authentication is completed, buyer 22 can access database 32 as shown. As noted above, application 40 can also directly access database 32 by way of communications link 28 for database data corresponding to an item selected by a buyer 22 so that an order may be completed. The data elements transferred must be sufficient to 1) describe and identify the item including the normalized classes/attributes/values, part number, description, and 2) provide sufficient

information to source the item, including vendor, cost, price, price history, and price expiration date. Typically, the data elements are transferred using pointer information provided by the inquiry of the database 32 by a buyer 22.

As shown in Figures 1 and 10, back office 24 itself is broken into a number of components. It includes catalog databases 32, back office communications interface 202, and the common language generator and CLG knowledge base 30. Each of the components can readily communicate with each other. For data transfer, a preferred mode of communication includes Extensible Markup Language ("XML"), which is a subset of the Standardized General Markup Language ("SGML"). HyperText Markup Language ("HTML") is appropriate for small data transfers between various portions of procurement system 20.

In general, interface 202 is used to communicate with buyer 22 by way of application 40 as noted above. However, when accessing catalog databases 32, buyer 22 can preferably bypass buyer interface application 40 as long as authentication has been completed. Interface 202 is also used to communicate with supplier 26. As shown by line 216 all order placement, acceptance, and order status information is shared between interface 202 and supplier 26. When structured requisition subsystem 102 is being used, interface 202 provides the structured requisition as shown by line 218 and receives a revised requisition as shown by line 220. Supplier item data is shown by line 221. Each of these lines comprises a portion of communications link 34 shown in Figure 1.

Supplier 26 has only limited contact with buyer 22 as shown in both Figures 1 and 10. The only direct contact between the two parties is when supplier 26 or its agent completes order fulfillment as shown by line 36.

Interface 202 uses information it receives from both buyer 22 and supplier 26 to selectively update catalog databases 32 as discussed with respect to catalog update subsystem 150 in Figure 9.

Knowledge base 30 is the glue that relates an item selection process with the items actually stored within a database 32. It is formed using pre-determined rules that have been established over time that relate items to class/attribute/value characteristics or relationships. These pre-determined relationships are pulled from CLG knowledge base 30 as shown by line 222 to be compared with potential classes/attributes/values received from supplier 26 as shown by line 220. Selective updating of the rules governing knowledge base 30 is shown by line 224. Line 226 represents the free form supplier item data to be normalized and then loaded into a database 32. The data is normalized using the class/attribute/value relationships that govern the common language generator and knowledge base 30. In some cases, however, a supplier 26 may be able to update its own database 32 without having to go through the Common Language Generator, particularly if an appropriate parametric structure has been set up using classes, attributes and values. For example, a supplier 26 may add or remove attributes or values associated with particular items or correct mistakes in attribute values and product descriptions. It may also delete or add entire items or groups of items. Under some circumstances a buyer 22 or the buyer's organization may be permitted to update its own local database 32 in a similar manner without direct involvement of back office 24 other than by providing the necessary interfaces.

Once the supplier data has been normalized using the class/attribute/value relationships of the CLG knowledge base 30, it is sent to an appropriate database 32 as shown by line 230 where the database entries are either imported or updated as

shown by line 232. The complete listing of all class/attribute/value relationships used by CLG knowledge base 30 are also contained within databases 32 and transferred from the knowledge base as shown by line 234. These relationships are used to undertake parametric searching and item specifying as discussed above. The class/attribute/value relationships are then updated when required as discussed above with respect to Figure 9.

The disclosed embodiments and examples are given to illustrate the present invention. However, they are not meant to limit the scope and spirit of the present invention. Therefore, the present invention should be limited only by the appended claims.

## CLAIMS

What is claimed is:

1. A procurement system for purchasing a special item, comprising:
  - a buyer for purchasing the special item;
  - a supplier for supplying the special item to said buyer;
  - a fulfillment organization for communicating between said buyer and said supplier;
  - a database associated with said fulfillment organization;
  - a special requisition; and
  - updated information, wherein said updated information is obtained in part from said special requisition and added to said database for future reference.
2. A procurement system as recited in claim 1, wherein said database of said organization comprises a knowledge base and a catalog database, said catalog database containing catalog item information normalized with respect to predetermined relationships in accordance with predetermined rules stored within said knowledge base.
3. A procurement system as recited in claim 2, wherein said special requisition is partially normalized according to said predetermined rules, with said buyer suggesting enhancements to said predetermined relationships for creating a potential unique description of the special item.

4. A procurement system as recited in claim 3, wherein said special requisition is reviewed by said supplier and includes a proposed modification to at least one of said predetermined relationships. .

5. A procurement system as recited in claim 4, including a new predetermined rule to uniquely identify the special item, said new predetermined rule based at least in part on said updated information contained within said special requisition.

6. A procurement system as recited in claim 4, wherein a plurality of said suppliers reviewed said special requisition and said fulfillment organization normalized said updated data received from each of said suppliers, and forwarded said updated information received from at least two of said suppliers for comparison by said buyer, said buyer comparing said updated information based on identical classes and attributes so as to provide a consistent basis for comparison between each special item available for purchase.

7. A procurement system as recited in claim 2, wherein suppliers are identified with specific predetermined relationships, said fulfillment organization comparing said special requisition prepared in accordance with said predetermined rules to select a plurality of said suppliers to receive and review said special requisition.

8. A procurement system as recited in claim 2, wherein said updated information related to the special item is normalized according to said predetermined rules and stored within said catalog database to uniquely identify the special item.



9. A procurement system as recited in claim 1, wherein said predetermined relationships include class, attribute and value characteristics.

10. A procurement system for purchasing a desired item, comprising:  
a normalized catalog database, wherein each unique catalog item stored within said catalog database is identified with respect to class, attribute, and value relationships;

a knowledge base, said knowledge base including a set of predetermined rules used to convert free form catalog item information into said normalized catalog database in accordance with said relationships;

an item selection procedure, said procedure relying on said relationships to locate the desired item within said catalog database; and

an item specifying procedure, said procedure invoked when the desired item cannot be located within said catalog database.

11. A procurement system as recited in claim 10, wherein said item specifying procedure includes a structured requisition subsystem, said subsystem including:

a structured requisition, said requisition based on said relationships and at least one new class, attribute or value added to said relationships to uniquely identify the desired item that cannot be located within said catalog database.

12. A procurement system as recited in claim 11, wherein suppliers are identified by said relationships used to create said structured requisition, said structured requisition being automatically sent to said suppliers by said system.

13. A procurement system as recited in claim 11, wherein said structured requisition is used to develop at least one new predetermined rule for uniquely identifying the desired item that cannot be located within said catalog database.

14. A procurement system as recited in claim 13, wherein said new predetermined rule is added to said knowledge base to provide an update to said relationships.

15. A procurement system as recited in claim 14, wherein identifying information concerning the desired item is stored in said database in accordance with said relationships.

16. A procurement system as recited in claim 15, wherein the desired item becomes a catalog item available through said selection procedure after undergoing said specifying procedure.

17. A procurement system for purchasing a desired item, comprising:

- a buyer;
- a first catalog database accessible to said buyer lacking said desired item;
- a second catalog database, wherein each unique catalog item stored within said second catalog is identified with respect to class, attribute, and value relationships;
- and
- an item selection procedure, said procedure relying on said relationships to search for the desired item within said second database when it is not located within said first database.

18. A procurement system as recited in claim 17, wherein said first catalog database is identified with respect to said relationships.

19. A procurement system as recited in claim 17, including a special requisition identifying the desired item prepared by said buyer using said class, attribute, and value relationships; and


a master database not normally accessible to said buyer including the desired item, said special requisition being used to search for the desired item in said master database.

20. A procurement system as recited in claim 19, wherein said special requisition is forwarded to a supplier who provides the desired item, one of said databases being updated with said desired item according to said class, attribute, and value relationships.


**INFORMATION TRANSLATION COMMUNICATION PROTOCOL****ABSTRACT OF THE DISCLOSURE**

An inventive procurement system includes a requisition system for special item purchases that are not found when searching a catalog database. Using the requisition system the buyer is provided with the desired item while the information associated with the requisition is selectively added to a rule-based knowledge base as well as to an item database. In a preferred embodiment a common language generator has been used to normalize free form data using pre-determined rules to place the data into a class/attribute/value relationship. By having the item requisition follow the same relationship, the pre-determined rules may be updated and the free-form data associated with the item properly coded for inclusion into an item database.

R0085930



**FIG. 1**



**FIG. 2**

002290" 2440360

Advanced Search

Search in:  Match: ☒ All Words (use AND)  
☐ Any Word (use OR)

Search for:

Select Field(s) to Search: Number of Hits to Display:

☒ Short Description ☐ Long Description  
☐ Manufacturer ☐ Manufacturer Product Number  
☐ Category ☐ Merchant Product Number

**FIG. 3**

Cat. No.	Unit/Price/Action	Material
1059910	EA / 5.51 <del>Shopping Basket</del> <del>Comparison List</del>	
105995	EA / 33.11 <del>Shopping Basket</del> <del>Comparison List</del> PK of 3 / 99.36 <del>Shopping Basket</del> <del>Comparison List</del>	Brass

**FIG. 4**



## Product Comparison



**Sales Assistance**

<b>Processor</b> <input type="text" value="486DX2 50"/> <input type="button" value="="/> <input type="button" value="≠"/>	<b>Memory</b> <input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> 8 <input type="checkbox"/> 16 <input type="checkbox"/> 32 <input type="button" value="="/> <input type="button" value="≠"/> <input type="button" value="≤"/> <input type="button" value="≥"/>	<b>Hard Drive</b> <input type="checkbox"/> 0 <input type="checkbox"/> 105 <input type="checkbox"/> 170 <input type="checkbox"/> 260 <input type="checkbox"/> 340 <input type="checkbox"/> 360 <input type="checkbox"/> 540 <input type="checkbox"/> 720 <input type="checkbox"/> 810 <input type="checkbox"/> 1,200 <input type="button" value="="/> <input type="button" value="≠"/> <input type="button" value="≤"/> <input type="button" value="≥"/>
<b>CD-ROM</b> <input type="radio"/> 2X <input checked="" type="radio"/> 4X <input type="radio"/> None <input type="button" value="="/> <input type="button" value="≠"/>	<b>Part Number</b> <input type="text" value="2524801"/> <input type="button" value="▲"/> <input type="text" value="252480F"/> <input type="button" value="▼"/> <input type="text" value="2524901"/> <input type="button" value="▲"/> <input type="button" value="="/> <input type="button" value="≠"/>	<b>Description</b> <input type="text" value="ThinkPad 360C"/> <input type="button" value="▲"/> <input type="text" value="ThinkPad 360CE"/> <input type="button" value="▼"/> <input type="text" value="ThinkPad 360Cs"/> <input type="button" value="▲"/> <input type="button" value="="/> <input type="button" value="≠"/>
<b>Type</b> <u>Notebook</u> <u>Pen Notebook</u> <u>Tablet</u>	<b>Operating System</b> <input type="text" value="IBM AIX Version 4 for Clients"/> <input type="button" value="▲"/> <input type="text" value="IBM DOS 6.3, Windows 3.1"/> <input type="button" value="▼"/> <input type="text" value="IBM DOS 6.3, Windows 3.1, Pen"/> <input type="button" value="▲"/> <input type="button" value="="/> <input type="button" value="≠"/>	<b>Price</b> <input type="text" value="\$1,280.00"/> <input type="button" value="▲"/> <input type="text" value="\$1,415.00"/> <input type="button" value="▼"/> <input type="text" value="\$1,529.00"/> <input type="button" value="▲"/> <input type="button" value="="/> <input type="button" value="≠"/> <input type="button" value="≤"/> <input type="button" value="≥"/>

**FIG. 6**



007290 " 062700



Product Comparison									
Uncheck to Remove	Image	Product	Description	Merchant	Product Number	Manufacturer	Unit of Measure	Price	Add to Shopping Basket
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<u>Gases in Lecture Bottles</u>	Gases in Lecture Bottles; Gas Ammonia; Outlet CGA 180	<u>Fisher Scientific</u>	10599A		EA	136.00	<u>Add</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<u>Gases in Lecture Bottles</u>	Gases in Lecture Bottles; Gas Carbon Dioxide; Outlet CGA 170	<u>Fisher Scientific</u>	10599E		EA	129.00	<u>Add</u>
<div>Refresh</div> <div>Clear All</div>									

FIG. 7





FIG. 7A



**FIG. 8**

002290 2440960

ProcureNet OneReq


Select Values

About OneReq

Features	Select Values	Or, Enter Values
DIAMETER	1 IN	1 IN
LENGTH	10 IN	10 IN
THREAD SIZE	10	10
THREAD	No Preference	
TENSILE STRENGTH	10	
MATERIAL	13	METAL
SPECIFICATION	2	ASTM A-193
GRADE	20	B7
FINISH	8	PLAIN
WARRANTY	9	
MANUFACTURER NAME	No Preference	
MANUFACTURER MODEL		
MANUFACTURER PART NUMBER	No Preference	
SUPPLIER NAME	FASTENAL	FASTENAL
SUPPLIER PART NUMBER	No Preference	
OWNER TAG/DRAWING		
MANUFACTURER DRAWING		
DESCRIPTION		
QUANTITY		
UNIT OF MEASURE	Please choose a Unit of Measure	

Submit OneReq:

FIG. 8A

[illegible]

**FIG. 9**

